arXiv:1510.00944v2 [math.RA] 14 Jan 2016

JORDAN DERIVATIONS OF FINITARY INCIDENCE RINGS

MYKOLA KHRYPCHENKO

Abstract. Let P be a preordered set, R a ring and $FI(P,R)$ the finitary incidence ring of P over R [7]. We find a criterion for all Jordan derivations of $FI(P,R)$ to be derivations and generalize Theorem 3.3 from [9]. In particular, we prove that each Jordan derivation of the ring $RFM_I(R)$ of row-finite $I\times I$-matrices over R is a derivation, if $|I|>1$.

Introduction

Given a ring R and $n\geq 2$, it follows from the classical results by Jacobson and Rickart ([6, Theorems 8 and 22]) that every Jordan derivation of the ring $M_n(R)$ of all $n\times n$-matrices is a derivation. Benkovič proved that the same is true for the algebra $T_n(R)$ of upper triangular $n\times n$-matrices over a commutative unital ring R of characteristic different from 2 ([2, Corollary 1.2]). In [4] the author described Jordan derivations of a subring of $M_n(R)$ which contains $T_n(R)$, under the same assumption on R (see [4, Theorem 1]). In particular, the Benkovič's result follows from this description ([4, Corollary 2]).

The algebra $T_n(R)$, $n\geq 2$, is a particular case of the triangular algebra $Tri(A,M,B)$, where A,B are unital R-algebras and M is an (A,B)-bimodule. Jordan derivations of such algebras over a ring of characteristics different from 2 were studied in [10]. Theorem 2.1 from [10] says that each Jordan derivation of $Tri(A,M,B)$ is a derivation, if M is faithful as a left A-module and as a right B-module.

Benkovič and Širovnik generalized [4, Theorem 1] to unital algebras admitting nontrivial idempotents with certain conditions ([3, Theorem 4.1]). This also permitted to obtain [10, Theorem 2.1] as a consequence (see [3, Corollary 4.3]).

Another example of a triangular algebra is the incidence algebra $I(P,R)$ of a finite poset P, $|P|\geq 2$, over a commutative ring R. Indeed, fixing an enumeration $P=\{x_1,\dots,x_n\}$ with $x_i\leq x_j\Rightarrow i\leq j$ and choosing $1\leq m\leq n$, one can show that $I(P,R)$ is isomorphic to $Tri(I(Q,R),M,I(P\setminus Q,R))$, where $Q=\{x_1,\dots,x_m\}$ and M consists of the functions $f\in I(P,R)$, such that $f(x,y)=0$, whenever $x,y\in Q$ or $x,y\in P\setminus Q$. However, [10, Theorem 2.1] cannot be directly applied to $I(P,R)$, because M is not always faithful as a left $I(Q,R)$-module or as a right $I(P\setminus Q,R)$-module. For instance, when P is an anti-chain, the bimodule M is trivial for any choice of Q. Nevertheless, using direct computations, Xiao proved in [9] that every Jordan derivation of $I(P,R)$ is a derivation, provided that P is a locally finite preordered set and $\operatorname{char} R\neq 2$ ([9, Theorem 3.3]).

Finitary incidence algebras appeared in [8] as a generalization of incidence algebras to the non-locally finite case. Initially they were defined, when P is a poset

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16W25; Secondary 16S60, 16S50.
Key words and phrases. Finitary incidence ring, Jordan derivation, derivation.

and R is a field. Then the definition was extended in [7] to the so-called partially ordered categories [7] and, in particular, to preordered sets and rings, giving thus the finitary incidence ring $FI(P,R)$ of P over R.

The aim of this article is to generalize [9, Theorem 3.3] to arbitrary P and R, considering $FI(P,R)$ instead of $I(P,R)$. To avoid the restriction on the characteristics of R, we use the Jacobson-Rickart's definition of a Jordan derivation [6, (26)–(27)].

In Section 2 we prove some results on Jordan derivations which take place in an arbitrary ring (see Lemmas 1–4).

In Section 3 we restrict ourselves to rings R admitting a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents which impose certain conditions on the multiplication in R. One should note that this class of rings contains the incidence ring $FI(P,R)$ as well as the ring $RFM_I(R)$ of row-finite matrices over R whose entries are indexed by the pairs of elements of I. The main result of Section 3 is Lemma 6 which permits us to construct a derivation d' of R from a Jordan derivation d of R under some assumptions on d.

In Section 4 we apply the lemmas from Sections 2 and 3 to the finitary incidence ring $FI(\mathcal{C})$ of a partially ordered category $\mathcal{C}$. Proposition 1 says that a Jordan derivation d of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is a derivation if and only if the "restriction" d_x of d to $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$ is a derivation for each $x \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$. Using this proposition and [10, Theorem 2.1] under certain restrictions on $\mathcal{C}$, we reduce the question whether all Jordan derivations of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ are derivations to the same question in the rings $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$, where x runs through the set of isolated objects of $\mathcal{C}$ (see Theorem 1).

In Section 5 we study Jordan derivations of the ring $RFM_I(R)$. We prove, with the help of Lemma 6 and the result by Jacobson and Rickart on Jordan derivations of $M_n(R)$, that each Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$ is a derivation, when $|I| > 1$ (see Theorem 2). Thus, we extend the Jacobson-Rickart's result to a ring of infinite matrices.

Section 6 is an easy application of Theorems 1 and 2. We show that each Jordan derivation of $FI(P,R)$ is a derivation, when P has no isolated elements. Otherwise the question whether each Jordan derivation of $FI(P,R)$ is a derivation reduces to the same question for the ring R (see Theorem 3). As a remark we obtain a generalization of [9, Theorem 3.3] (see Remark 6).

1. Preliminaries

Let R be a ring and d an additive map $d : R \to R$. Following [6], we shall call d a *Jordan derivation* of R, if it satisfies

$$d(r^2) = d(r)r + rd(r), \tag{1}$$

$$d(rsr) = d(r)sr + rd(s)r + rsd(r) \tag{2}$$

for arbitrary $r, s \in R$. Obviously, a usual derivation of R, that is an additive map $d : R \to R$ with

$$d(rs) = d(r)s + rd(s)$$

for all $r, s \in R$, is a Jordan derivation of R.

Let d be a Jordan derivation of R. Applying (1) to the sum $r+s$, we immediately get

$$d(rs + sr) = d(r)s + rd(s) + d(s)r + sd(r) \tag{3}$$

for all $r, s \in R$. Equality (3) is often used as a definition of a Jordan derivation of R (see, for example, [5]). It is in fact equivalent to (1), when $\operatorname{char} R \neq 2$. Indeed, to get (1), one simply substitutes $s = r$ into (3) and "divides" both sides by 2. Condition (2) also follows from (3) in this case: to prove it, one sets $s = rs' + s'r$ in (3), where s' is an arbitrary element of R (see [5, Lemma 3.1]).

We shall also use the following formula by Herstein ([5, Lemma 3.2]):

$$d(rst + tsr) = d(r)st + rd(s)t + rsd(t) + d(t)sr + td(s)r + tsd(r), \tag{4}$$

which is a consequence of (2) with r replaced by $r + t$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a preadditive small category. We shall call $\mathcal{C}$ a *pocategory*, when $\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ admits a partial order $\leq$. Denote by $I(\mathcal{C})$ the set of the formal sums

$$\alpha = \sum_{x \leq y} \alpha_{xy}[x, y], \tag{5}$$

where $x, y \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, $[x, y] = \{z \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C} \mid x \leq z \leq y\}$ and $\alpha_{xy} \in \operatorname{Mor}(x, y)$. Clearly, $I(\mathcal{C})$ is an abelian group under the addition, which naturally comes from the addition of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$. Without loss of generality we shall also consider the series α of the form (5), whose indices run through a subset X of the segments of $\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, meaning that α_{xy} is the zero 0_{xy} of $\operatorname{Mor}(x, y)$ for $[x, y] \notin X$.

The sum (5) is called a *finitary series*, whenever for any pair of $x, y \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ with $x < y$ there exists only a finite number of $u, v \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, such that $x \leq u < v \leq y$ and $\alpha_{uv} \neq 0_{uv}$. The set of finitary series will be denoted by $FI(\mathcal{C})$. Note that $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is an additive subgroup of $I(\mathcal{C})$. Moreover, $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under the convolution of the series:

$$\alpha\beta = \sum_{x \leq y} \left(\sum_{x \leq z \leq y} \alpha_{xz}\beta_{zy} \right) [x, y] \tag{6}$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in FI(\mathcal{C})$. Thus, $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is a ring, called the *finitary incidence ring of* $\mathcal{C}$ [1]

Given $x \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, denote by e_x the element $\mathrm{id}_x[x, x] \in FI(\mathcal{C})$, where id_x is the identity morphism from $\operatorname{Mor}(x, x)$. Observe that

$$e_x \alpha e_y = \begin{cases} \alpha_{xy}[x, y], & x \leq y, \\ 0, & x \not\leq y. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Let $(P, \preceq)$ be a preordered set and R a ring. We slightly change the construction of the pocategory $\mathcal{C}(P, R)$, introduced in [7].

Denote by $\sim$ the natural equivalence relation on P, namely $x \sim y \Leftrightarrow x \preceq y \preceq x$, and by $\overline{P}$ the quotient set $P/\!\sim$. Define $\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}(P, R)$ to be $\overline{P}$ with the induced partial order $\leq$. For any pair $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}(P, R)$:

$$\operatorname{Mor}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = RFM_{\bar{x} \times \bar{y}}(R),$$

where $RFM_{I \times J}(R)$ denotes the additive group of row-finite matrices over R, whose rows are indexed by the elements of I and columns by the elements of J (for the ring $RFM_{I \times I}(R)$ we shall use the shorter notation $RFM_I(R)$). The composition of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}(P, R)$ is the matrix multiplication, which is defined by the row-finiteness condition.

[1] In [7] by a pocategory one means a preadditive small category $\mathcal{C}$ with a partial order $\leq$ on $\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ satisfying $x \leq y \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Mor}(x, y) \neq 0_{xy}$. It turns out that the last property is superfluous for the definition of $FI(\mathcal{C})$.

The *finitary incidence ring* [7] *of P over R*, denoted by $FI(P,R)$, is by definition $FI(\mathcal{C}(P,R))$.[2]

2. Some technical lemmas

Let R be an arbitrary (associative) ring. An *idempotent* of R is an element $e \in R$ with $e^2 = e$. The set of idempotents of R is denoted by $E(R)$. Two (distinct) idempotents are called *orthogonal* if they commute and their product is zero.

Lemma 1. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of R and $r \in R$. For any pair of orthogonal $e, f \in E(R)$:*

$$ed(r)f = ed(erf)f - ed(e)rf - erd(f)f + ed(fre)f. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, for any $e \in E(R)$:

$$ed(r)e = ed(ere)e - ed(e)re - erd(e)e. \tag{9}$$

Proof. By (4)

$$d(erf + fre) = d(e)rf + ed(r)f + erd(f) + d(f)re + fd(r)e + frd(e).$$

Multiplying this by e on the left and by f on the right and using the assumption that $ef = fe = 0$, we come to (8).

For (9) we use (2):

$$d(ere) = d(e)re + ed(r)e + erd(e).$$

□

Corollary 1. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of R, $e, f \in E(R)$ be orthogonal and $r \in fRf$. Then $ed(r)e = 0$.*

For $er = re = 0$ in this case, so the right-hand side of (9) is zero.

Remark 1. Under the conditions of Lemma 1 if d is a derivation of R, then $ed(fre)f = 0$.

Indeed, in this case $d(erf) = d(e)rf + ed(r)f + erd(f)$, and thus $ed(r)f = ed(erf)f - ed(e)rf - erd(f)f$. Comparing this with (8), we obtain the desired equality.

Lemma 2. *Given a Jordan derivation d of R, for all $e, f \in E(R)$, which are either orthogonal or equal, one has*

$$ed(e)f + ed(f)f = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose that e and f are orthogonal. Substitute $r = e$ into (8):

$$ed(e)f = ed(ef)f - ed(e)ef - ed(f)f + ed(fe)f,$$

which is $-ed(f)f$, as $ef = fe = 0$.

If $e = f$, then set $r = e$ in (9):

$$ed(e)e = ed(e)e - ed(e)e - ed(e)e = -ed(e)e.$$

□

Given a map $d : R \to R$ and $e \in E(R)$, denote by d_e the map $eRe \to eRe$ with $d_e(r) = ed(r)e$, $r \in eRe$.

[2]We allow $\mathrm{Mor}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ to be nonzero, when $x \not\leq y$, in contrast with [7]. This, however, does not change the resulting ring $FI(P,R)$.

Remark 2. Let d be a map $R \to R$ and $e, f \in E(R)$ with $ef = fe = e$. Then $eRe \subseteq fRf$ and $d_e = (d_f)_e$.

Indeed, $eRe = feRef \subseteq fRf$, and for any $r \in eRe$ one has

$$d_e(r) = ed(r)e = efd(r)fe = ed_f(r)e = (d_f)_e(r).$$

Lemma 3. *Let d be a derivation (respectively Jordan derivation) of R. Then d_e is a derivation (respectively Jordan derivation) of the ring eRe.*

Proof. We prove the assertion, when d is a derivation of R (the proof for a Jordan derivation is similar).

Clearly, d_e is additive. Taking $r, s \in eRe$, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} d_e(rs) = ed(rs)e = e(d(r)s + rd(s))e = ed(r)se + erd(s)e \\ = ed(r)es + red(s)e = d_e(r)s + rd_e(s). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the obvious fact that r and s commute with e. □

Lemma 4. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of R, e, f, g a triple of idempotents of R, any two distinct elements of which are orthogonal and at least two elements of which are different. Then for all $r \in eRg$ and $s \in gRf$ one has*

$$ed(rs)f = ed(r)s + rd(s)f. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Suppose first that $e \neq f$. Then $sr = 0$, so by (3)

$$d(rs) = d(r)s + rd(s) + d(s)r + sd(r).$$

To get (10), it is enough to prove that

$$ed(s)rf = esd(r)f = 0. \tag{11}$$

If $e \neq g \neq f$, then (11) follows from $rf = es = 0$. Consider now the subcase $e = g \neq f$. We immediately have $ed(s)rf = 0$, as $rf = 0$. Furthermore, since $gs = sf$, then

$$esd(r)f = gsd(r)f = sfd(r)f,$$

which is zero by Corollary 1. The subcase $e \neq g = f$ is symmetric to the previous one.

It remains to consider the case $e = f \neq g$. Now sr may be nonzero, however $ed(sr)f = ed(sr)e = 0$ thanks to Corollary 1. As above, (10) is explained by (11), because $rf = es = 0$. □

Corollary 2. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of R. Then d satisfies* (10) *for all triples $e, f, g \in E(R)$, any two distinct elements of which are orthogonal, if and only if d_e is a derivation of eRe for all $e \in E(R)$.*

Indeed, in view of Lemma 4 equality (10) holds for all such triples $e, f, g \in E(R)$ if and only if it holds for $e = f = g \in E(R)$, that is $d_e(rs) = d_e(r)s + rd_e(s)$ with $r, s \in eRe$.

3. Jordan derivations of a ring with certain set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents

From now on suppose that the ring R admits a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents E such that, given $r \in R$ and $e, f \in E$, the set

$$E(e,r,f) := \{g \in E \mid erg \neq 0 \text{ and } \exists s \in R : gsf \neq 0\} \text{ is finite.} \tag{12}$$

Taking additionally $s \in R$, we see that

$$E(e,r,s,f) := \{g \in E \mid ergsf \neq 0\} \subseteq E(e,r,f),$$

so $|E(e,r,s,f)| < \infty$. We shall also require that R satisfies

$$ersf = \sum_{g \in E(e,r,s,f)} ergsf, \tag{13}$$

where the latter sum is defined to be 0, when $E(e,r,s,f) = \emptyset$.

Remark 3. It is obvious that in (13) one can replace $E(e,r,s,f)$ by any finite subset of E containing $E(e,r,s,f)$.

Lemma 5. *Let $d : R \to R$ be a map. Then for all $r, s \in R$ and $e, f \in E$ the set*

$$X = \{(g,h) \in E \times E \mid ergd(g)hsf \neq 0\}$$

is finite.

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that X is infinite. Note that if $(g,h) \in X$, then $erg \neq 0$ and $gd(g)hsf \neq 0$, so $g \in E(e,r,f)$. In view of (12) there is only a finite number of such g. Hence, one can find $g' \in E$ and infinitely many $h \in E$, such that $g'd(g')hsf \neq 0$. The latter implies that $E(g', d(g'), f)$ is infinite. This is impossible due to (12). □

Lemma 6. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of R, such that for all $e \in E$ the map d_e is a derivation of eRe. Suppose that, given $r \in R$, there exists a unique $d'(r) \in R$ with*

$$ed'(r)f = ed(erf)f - ed(e)rf - erd(f)f \tag{14}$$

for all $e, f \in E$. Then the map $d' : R \to R$ is a derivation of R.

Proof. First of all observe from (14) that

$$ed'(r+s)f = ed(e(r+s)f)f - ed(e)(r+s)f - e(r+s)d(f)f = e(d'(r) + d'(s))f$$

due to additivity of d. By the uniqueness of $d'(r+s)$ we have $d'(r+s) = d'(r)+d'(s)$.

Fix $r, s \in R$ and $e, f \in E$. We shall show that $e(d'(r)s + rd'(s))f = ed'(rs)f$. By(13) and (14) and Remark 3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} ed'(r)sf &= \sum_{g \in E'} ed'(r)gsf \\ &= \sum_{g \in E'} (ed(erg)g - ed(e)rg - erd(g)g)sf, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} erd'(s)f &= \sum_{g \in E'} ergd'(s)f \\ &= \sum_{g \in E'} er(gd(gsf)f - gd(g)sf - gsd(f)f), \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where E' is the union of finite sets $\bigcup_{i=1}^{6} E_i$ with

$$E_1 = E(e, d'(r), s, f),$$
$$E_2 = E(e, r, d'(s), f),$$
$$E_3 = E(e, d(e)r, s, f),$$
$$E_4 = E(e, r, sd(f), f),$$
$$E_5 = E(e, r, s, f),$$
E_6 being such that $\{(g,h) \in E \times E \mid ergd(g)hsf \neq 0\} \subseteq E_6 \times E_6$

(the latter is finite by Lemma 5). Adding (15) and (16), we get

$$e(d'(r)s + rd'(s))f = \sum_{g\in E'} (ed(erg)gsf + ergd(gsf)f) \tag{17}$$
$$- \sum_{g\in E'} ed(e)rgsf - \sum_{g\in E'} ergsd(f)f \tag{18}$$
$$- \sum_{g\in E'} (erd(g)gsf + ergd(g)sf). \tag{19}$$

Clearly, (18) is

$$- \sum_{g\in E_3} ed(e)rgsf - \sum_{g\in E_4} ergsd(f)f = -ed(e)rsf - ersd(f)f.$$

By Corollary 2 the right-hand side of (17) is

$$\sum_{g\in E'} ed(ergsf)f = ed\left(\sum_{g\in E'} ergsf\right) f = ed\left(\sum_{g\in E_5} ergsf\right) f = ed(ersf)f.$$

By (13) the sum (19) equals

$$- \sum_{g\in E'} \left(\sum_{h\in E_7} erhd(g)gsf + \sum_{h\in E_8} ergd(g)hsf \right), \tag{20}$$

where E_7 and E_8 are finite subsets of E, more precisely,

$$E_7 = \bigcup_{g\in E'} E(e, r, d(g), g),$$
$$E_8 = \bigcup_{g\in E'} E(g, d(g), s, f).$$

Setting $E'' = E' \cup E_7 \cup E_8$, we conclude that (20) is

$$- \sum_{(g,h)\in E'\times E''} erhd(g)gsf - \sum_{(g,h)\in E'\times E''} ergd(g)hsf$$

Interchanging g and h in the first sum and using Lemma 2, we get

$$- \sum_{(g,h)\in E''\times E'} ergd(h)hsf - \sum_{(g,h)\in E'\times E''} ergd(g)hsf$$
$$= \sum_{(g,h)\in E''\times E'} ergd(g)hsf - \sum_{(g,h)\in E'\times E''} ergd(g)hsf. \tag{21}$$

Since

$$\{(g,h)\in E\times E\mid ergd(g)hsf\neq 0\}\subseteq E_6\times E_6\subseteq E'\times E'\subseteq (E'\times E'')\cap(E''\times E'),$$

it follows that (21) equals

$$\sum_{(g,h)\in E_6\times E_6} ergd(g)hsf-\sum_{(g,h)\in E_6\times E_6} ergd(g)hsf=0.$$

Thus,

$$e(d'(r)s+rd'(s))f=ed(ersf)f-ed(e)rsf-ersd(f)f,$$

the latter being $ed'(rs)f$ by (14). In view of the uniqueness of $d'(rs)$, one has $d'(rs)=d'(r)s+rd'(s)$. Since r and s were arbitrary elements of R, the map d' is a derivation. □

4. Jordan derivations of $FI(\mathcal{C})$

We first specify Lemma 1 for $FI(\mathcal{C})$ and the idempotents $e_x, e_y\in FI(\mathcal{C})$.

Lemma 7. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$. Then for any $\alpha\in FI(\mathcal{C})$ and for all $x\leq y$:*

$$d(\alpha)_{xy}=d(\alpha_{xy}[x,y])_{xy}-(d(e_x)\alpha)_{xy}-(\alpha d(e_y))_{xy}.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $x<y$. Then the idempotents e_x and e_y are orthogonal, so by (8)

$$e_xd(\alpha)e_y=e_xd(e_x\alpha e_y)e_y-e_xd(e_x)\alpha e_y-e_x\alpha d(e_y)e_y+e_xd(e_y\alpha e_x)e_y.$$

Note that $x<y$ means that $x\leq y$ and $y\not\leq x$. It remains to apply (7).

When $x=y$, the result follows from (9) with $e=e_x$ and (7). □

Lemma 8. *The ring $FI(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies*(12) *and* (13) *with E being $\{e_x\}_{x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}}$.*

Proof. Clearly, E is a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents of $FI(\mathcal{C})$. Let $\alpha\in FI(\mathcal{C})$ and $x,y\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$.

If $x\not\leq y$, then for any $z\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ either $x\not\leq z$, or $z\not\leq y$. In the first case $e_x\alpha e_z=0$, and in the second one $e_z\beta e_y=0$ for any $\beta\in FI(\mathcal{C})$, thanks to (7). Hence $E(e_x,\alpha,e_y)=\emptyset$, so (12) holds. As $e_x\alpha\beta e_y=0$ by (7), equality (13) also takes place.

If $x\leq y$, then $e_x\alpha e_z\neq 0$ means that $\alpha_{xz}\neq 0_{xz}$ (in particular, $x\leq z$) and $\exists\beta\in FI(\mathcal{C}):e_z\beta e_y\neq 0$ implies that $z\leq y$. Therefore,

$$\{z\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}\mid e_z\in E(e_x,\alpha,e_y)\}\subseteq\{z\in[x,y]\mid\alpha_{xz}\neq 0_{xz}\},$$

the latter set being finite due to the fact that α is a finitary series, whence (12). As to (13), observe from (7) that $e_x\alpha e_z\beta e_y=\alpha_{xz}\beta_{zy}[x,y]$, so

$$Z:=\{z\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}\mid e_z\in E(e_x,\alpha,\beta,e_y)\}=\{z\in[x,y]\mid\alpha_{xz}\beta_{zy}\neq 0_{xy}\}.$$

Moreover, by (6)

$$\begin{aligned}e_x\alpha\beta e_y=(\alpha\beta)_{xy}[x,y]&=\left(\sum_{x\leq z\leq y}\alpha_{xz}\beta_{zy}\right)[x,y]=\left(\sum_{z\in Z}\alpha_{xz}\beta_{zy}\right)[x,y]\\&=\sum_{z\in Z}(\alpha_{xz}[x,z]\cdot\beta_{zy}[z,y])=\sum_{e_z\in E(e_x,\alpha,\beta,e_y)}e_x\alpha e_z\beta e_y,\end{aligned}$$

proving (13). □

Let $d : FI(\mathcal{C}) \to FI(\mathcal{C})$ and $x \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$. Observe that the ring $e_x FI(\mathcal{C})e_x$ may be identified with $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$ by $e_x \alpha e_x = \alpha_{xx}[x,x] \leftrightarrow \alpha_{xx}$. Denote by d_x the map $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x) \to \mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$, which corresponds to $d_{e_x} : e_x FI(\mathcal{C})e_x \to e_x FI(\mathcal{C})e_x$ under this identification, namely, $d_x(\varphi) = d(\varphi[x,x])_{xx}$ for $\varphi \in \mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$.

Proposition 1. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$. Then d is a derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if for all $x \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$ the map d_x is a derivation of $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$.*

Proof. The necessity is explained by Lemma 3.

For the sufficiency consider (14) with $e = e_x$, $f = e_y$ and $r = \alpha \in FI(\mathcal{C})$:

$$d'(\alpha)_{xy} = d(\alpha_{xy}[x,y])_{xy} - (d(e_x)\alpha)_{xy} - (\alpha d(e_y))_{xy}.$$

The right-hand side is $d(\alpha)_{xy}$ by Lemma 7. Therefore, $d' = d$, in particular, d' is a well-defined function $FI(\mathcal{C}) \to FI(\mathcal{C})$. It remains to apply Lemmas 6 and 8. □

An element of a preordered set will be said to be *isolated*, whenever it is incomparable with any other element of this set. In particular, an object $x \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$ is *isolated*, if it is isolated under $\leq$.

Lemma 9. *Let $x \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$ be isolated. For any map $d : \mathrm{Mor}(x,x) \to \mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$ and $\alpha \in FI(\mathcal{C})$ define*

$$\tilde{d}(\alpha) = d(\alpha_{xx})[x,x] + \alpha - \alpha_{xx}[x,x]. \tag{22}$$

Then $\tilde{d}$ is a derivation (respectively Jordan derivation) of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if d is a derivation (respectively Jordan derivation) of $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$.

Proof. Clearly, $\tilde{d}(\alpha)$ is a finitary series, as $\tilde{d}(\alpha)_{uv} = \alpha_{uv}$ for all $u < v$.

Since x is incomparable with the rest of the objects of $\mathcal{C}$, then $FI(\mathcal{C}) = FI(\{x\}) \oplus FI(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{x\})$. Here $\{x\}$ is the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ with the unique object x and $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{x\}$ denotes the subcategory obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by removing x as well as all the morphisms from x and into x. It remains to note that $FI(\{x\}) \cong \mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$ and $\tilde{d} = d \oplus \mathrm{id}$ up to this isomorphism. □

Let M be a unital (R,S)-bimodule. Following [10] by the *triangular ring* $Tri(R,M,S)$ we mean the ring whose additive group is $R \oplus M \oplus S$ and the multiplication is defined by

$$(r,m,s)(r',m',s') = (rr', rm' + ms', ss')$$

(the same construction can also be found in [1]). The next remark is straightforward.

Remark 4. Let with $x < y$. Then $\mathrm{Mor}(x,y)$ is a (unital) $(\mathrm{Mor}(x,x), \mathrm{Mor}(y,y))$-bimodule, such that

$$Tri(\mathrm{Mor}(x,x), \mathrm{Mor}(x,y), \mathrm{Mor}(y,y)) \cong (e_x + e_y)FI(\mathcal{C})(e_x + e_y).$$

Indeed, the isomorphism is given by $(\varphi, \psi, \eta) \leftrightarrow \varphi[x,x] + \psi[x,y] + \eta[y,y]$, where $\varphi \in \mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$, $\psi \in \mathrm{Mor}(x,y)$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{Mor}(y,y)$.

We say that an (R,S)-bimodule is *faithful on the left (respectively on the right)*, if it is faithful as a left R-module (respectively as a right S-module).

Lemma 10. *Let $x < y$ be such that $\mathrm{Mor}(x,y)$ is faithful on the left and on the right. If d is a Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$, then d_x and d_y are derivations of $\mathrm{Mor}(x,x)$ and $\mathrm{Mor}(y,y)$ respectively.*

Proof. By Remark 4 the ring $(e_x+e_y)FI(\mathcal{C})(e_x+e_y)$ is triangular and by Lemma 3 the map $d_{e_x+e_y}$ is a Jordan derivation of $(e_x+e_y)FI(\mathcal{C})(e_x+e_y)$. Hence, $d_{e_x+e_y}$ is a derivation of $(e_x+e_y)FI(\mathcal{C})(e_x+e_y)$ in view of [10, Theorem 2.1][3] Then d_{e_x}, being $(d_{e_x+e_y})_{e_x}$ thanks to Remark 2, is a derivation of $e_xFI(\mathcal{C})e_x$ by the same Lemma 3. Similarly $d_{e_y}=(d_{e_x+e_y})_{e_y}$ is a derivation of $e_yFI(\mathcal{C})e_y$. As d_x and d_y may be identified with d_{e_x} and d_{e_y}, this completes the proof. □

Theorem 1. *Assume that for any non-isolated $x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ there is $y>x$ (or $y<x$), such that* $\operatorname{Mor}(x,y)$ *(or* $\operatorname{Mor}(y,x)$*) is faithful on the left and on the right. Then each Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is a derivation if and only if for any isolated $x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ each Jordan derivation of* $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$ *is a derivation.*

Proof. Suppose that each Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ is a derivation. Take an isolated $x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ and a Jordan derivation d of $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$. By Lemma 9 the map $\tilde{d}$ defined by (22) is a Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ and hence a derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ by the assumption. By the same lemma d is a derivation of $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$.

Conversely, assume that, given an isolated $x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, each Jordan derivation of $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$ is a derivation. Let d be a Jordan derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ and $x\in\operatorname{Ob}\mathcal{C}$. If x is isolated, then d_x is a derivation of $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$ by the assumption. Otherwise there exists $y>x$ (or $y<x$), such that $\operatorname{Mor}(x,y)$ (or $\operatorname{Mor}(y,x)$) is faithful on the left and on the right. Hence d_x is a derivation of $\operatorname{Mor}(x,x)$ thanks to Lemma 10. Consequently, d is a derivation of $FI(\mathcal{C})$ in view of Proposition 1. □

5. Jordan derivations of $RFM_I(R)$

Let R be a unital ring and I a set. Denote by e_{ij}, $i,j\in I$, the matrix from $RFM_I(R)$ having a unique nonzero element equal to 1 at the intersection of the i-th row and j-th column. Then $\{e_{ii}\}_{i\in I}$ is a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents of $RFM_I(R)$. Given a matrix $\alpha=\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j\in I}\in RFM_I(R)$, the product $e_{ii}\alpha e_{jj}$ is clearly $\alpha_{ij}e_{ij}$.

We first reformulate Lemma 1 in these notations.

Lemma 11. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$. For any $\alpha\in RFM_I(R)$ and $i\neq j\in I$:*

$$d(\alpha)_{ij}=d(\alpha_{ij}e_{ij})_{ij}-(d(e_{ii})\alpha)_{ij}-(\alpha d(e_{jj}))_{ij}+d(\alpha_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij}. \tag{23}$$

Moreover,

$$d(\alpha)_{ii}=d(\alpha_{ii}e_{ii})_{ii}-(d(e_{ii})\alpha)_{ii}-(\alpha d(e_{ii}))_{ii}. \tag{24}$$

Lemma 12. *The ring $RFM_I(R)$ satisfies*(12) *and* (13) *with $E=\{e_{ii}\}_{i\in I}$.*

Proof. Given $\alpha\in RFM_I(R)$ and $i,j\in I$, one clearly has

$$\{k\in I\mid e_{kk}\in E(e_{ii},\alpha,e_{jj})\}\subseteq\{k\in I\mid e_{ii}\alpha e_{kk}\neq 0\}=\{k\in I\mid\alpha_{ik}\neq 0\},$$

which is finite due to the row-finiteness condition. This proves (12). Moreover, for any $\beta\in RFM_I(R)$:

$$I'=\{k\in I\mid e_{kk}\in E(e_{ii},\alpha,\beta,e_{jj})\}=\{k\in I\mid\alpha_{ik}\beta_{kj}\neq 0\},$$

[3]In [10] the authors study Jordan derivations of triangular algebras over commutative rings of characteristics different from 2. However, their proofs are based on formulas (1)–(4) and do not use the vector space structure, so the main result is true for Jordan derivations (in the sense of [6]) of triangular rings.

so

$$e_{ii}\alpha\beta e_{jj} = (\alpha\beta)_{ij}e_{ij} = \left(\sum_{k\in I'}\alpha_{ik}\beta_{kj}\right)e_{ij} = \sum_{k\in I'} e_{ii}\alpha e_{kk}\beta e_{jj},$$

giving (13). □

For each $i \in I$ the ring $e_{ii}RFM_I(R)e_{ii} = Re_{ii}$ is obviously isomorphic to R. If d is a map from $RFM_I(R)$ to itself and $i \in I$, then d_i denotes the induced map $R \to R$, namely, $d_i(r) = d(re_{ii})_{ii}$.

Let us write (14) for $e = e_{ii}$, $f = e_{jj}$ and $r = \alpha \in RFM_I(R)$:

$$d'(\alpha)_{ij} = d(\alpha_{ij}e_{ij})_{ij} - (d(e_{ii})\alpha)_{ij} - (\alpha d(e_{jj}))_{ij}. \tag{25}$$

This defines a (unique) matrix $d'(\alpha)$ over R whose entries are indexed by the pairs of elements of I. It is not clear, however, whether $d'(\alpha)$ is row-finite.

Lemma 13. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$ and $\alpha \in RFM_I(R)$. Then $d'(\alpha) \in RFM_I(R)$.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there are $i \in I$ and an infinite $J \subseteq I$, such that $d'(\alpha)_{ij} \neq 0$ for $j \in J$. According to (25) at least one of the sets

$$A = \{d(\alpha_{ij}e_{ij})_{ij}\}_{j\in J}, \quad B = \{(d(e_{ii})\alpha)_{ij}\}_{j\in J}, \quad C = \{(\alpha d(e_{jj}))_{ij}\}_{j\in J}$$

should have infinitely many nonzero elements.

Since α is row-finite, then there is a finite $J' \subseteq J$ with $\alpha_{ij'} = 0$ for $j' \in J \setminus J'$. Therefore, $d(\alpha_{ij'}e_{ij'}) = 0$ for such j', so the set of nonzero elements of A is finite.

Furthermore, the elements of B belong to the i-th row of the fixed (in the sense that it does not depend on j) row-finite matrix $d(e_{ii})\alpha$. Hence, B has only finitely many nonzero elements.

Suppose that the set of nonzero elements of C is infinite. For simplicity assume that all the elements of C are nonzero. As $(\alpha d(e_{jj}))_{ij} = \sum_{k\in I}\alpha_{ik}d(e_{jj})_{kj}$, for each $j \in J$ there is $k_j \in I$, such that both α_{ik_j} and $d(e_{jj})_{k_jj}$ are nonzero. But α is row-finite, so there is only a finite number of different indices k_j. Hence, one can find k' among them, such that $k' = k_j$ for infinitely many $j \in J$. Consequently, $d(e_{jj})_{k'j} \neq 0$ for infinitely many $j \in J$. However, by Lemma 2 with $e = e_{k'k'}$ and $f = e_{jj}$ one has $0 \neq d(e_{jj})_{k'j} = -d(e_{k'k'})_{k'j}$. We get a contradiction with the fact that $d(e_{k'k'})$ is row-finite. □

Corollary 3. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$, such that for each $i \in I$ the map d_i is a derivation of R. Then d' is a derivation of $RFM_I(R)$.*

This immediately follows from Lemmas 6, 12 and 13.

Lemma 14. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$. Then d is a derivation of $RFM_I(R)$ if and only if for all $i \in I$ the map d_i is a derivation of R.*

Proof. The necessity is Lemma 3.

For the sufficiency we use the idea of the proof of [9, Theorem 3.3]. When $|I| = 1$, the assertion is trivial. Suppose that $|I| > 1$ and d_i is a derivation of R for each $i \in I$. By Corollary 3 the map d' is a derivation of $RFM_I(R)$. Therefore, $d - d'$ is a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$. Note from(23)–(25) that

$$(d - d')(\alpha)_{ij} = d(\alpha_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij}, \quad i \neq j, \tag{26}$$

$$(d - d')(\alpha)_{ii} = 0. \tag{27}$$

Fix a pair of distinct $i, j \in I$ (such a pair exists, as $|I| > 1$). Denote by A_{ij} the R-submodule of $RFM_I(R)$ generated by $e_{ii}, e_{ij}, e_{ji}, e_{jj}$. It is clearly a subring of $RFM_I(R)$ isomorphic to the ring of 2×2 matrices over R. Let $\alpha \in A_{ij}$ and $k \neq l$ with $\{k, l\} \neq \{i, j\}$. One sees from (26) that $(d - d')(\alpha)_{kl} = 0$, as $\alpha_{lk} = 0$. Hence, $(d - d')(\alpha) \in A_{ij}$ and thus A_{ij} is invariant under $d - d'$. It follows that $(d - d')|_{A_{ij}}$ is a Jordan derivation of A_{ij} and hence a derivation of A_{ij} in view of Theorems 8 and 22 from [6].

For any $\alpha \in RFM_I(R)$ set

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_{ii}e_{ii} + \alpha_{ij}e_{ij} + \alpha_{ji}e_{ji} + \alpha_{jj}e_{jj} \in A_{ij}. \tag{28}$$

Since $(d - d')|_{A_{ij}}$ is a derivation of A_{ij}, by Remark 1 we have $(d - d')(\tilde{\alpha}_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij} = 0$. But

$$(d - d')(\tilde{\alpha}_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij} = d(\tilde{\alpha}_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij} = d(\alpha_{ji}e_{ji})_{ij} = (d - d')(\alpha)_{ij}$$

thanks to (26) and (28). So, $(d - d')(\alpha)_{ij} = 0$. As i and j were arbitrary (distinct) elements of I, together with (27) this means that $(d - d')(\alpha) = 0$. Thus, $d = d'$ and hence it is a derivation. □

Lemma 15. *Let d be a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$. If $|I| > 1$ and $i \in I$, then d_i is a derivation of R.*

Proof. As $|I| > 1$, there exists $j \neq i$ in I. Let A_{ij} denote the subring of $RFM_I(R)$ from the proof of Lemma 14. Note that $A_{ij} = eRFM_I(R)e$, where e is the idempotent $e_{ii} + e_{jj}$. By Lemma 3 the map d_e is a Jordan derivation of A_{ij}. Since A_{ij} is isomorphic to the ring of 2×2 matrices over R, then d_e is a derivation of A_{ij} according to Theorems 8 and 22 from [6].

Now since $e_{ii}e = ee_{ii} = e_{ii}$, thanks to Remark 2 we have $e_{ii}RFM_I(R)e_{ii} \subseteq A_{ij}$ and $d_{e_{ii}} = (d_e)_{e_{ii}}$, so $d_{e_{ii}}$ is a derivation of $e_{ii}RFM_I(R)e_{ii}$ by Lemma 3. The latter means that d_i is a derivation of R. □

Theorem 2. *Let R be a ring and I a set. If $|I| > 1$, then each Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$ is a derivation.*

Proof. A direct consequence of Lemmas 14 and 15. □

Remark 5. If $|I| = 1$, then $RFM_I(R) \cong R$, so the question whether a Jordan derivation of $RFM_I(R)$ is a derivation reduces to the same question for the ring R.

6. Jordan derivations of $FI(P, R)$

Lemma 16. *Let R be a unital ring and I, J (nonempty) sets. Then $RFM_{I\times J}(R)$ is faithful as a left $RFM_I(R)$-module and as a right $RFM_J(R)$-module.*

Proof. We prove the assertion for the left module, the proof for the right module is similar.

Let $\alpha \in RFM_I(R)$. Suppose that $\alpha\beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in RFM_{I\times J}(R)$. Fix $i, i' \in I$. Choose an arbitrary $j \in J$ and consider the matrix $e_{i'j} \in RFM_{I\times J}(R)$. By our assumption $\alpha e_{i'j} = 0$. In particular, $0 = (\alpha e_{i'j})_{ij} = \alpha_{ii'}$. Since i and i' were arbitrary elements of I, the latter means that $\alpha = 0$. □

Theorem 3. *Let $(P, \preceq)$ be a preordered set and R a unital ring. If P has no isolated elements, then every Jordan derivation of $FI(P, R)$ is a derivation. Otherwise every Jordan derivation of $FI(P, R)$ is a derivation if and only if every Jordan derivation of R is a derivation.*

Proof. By Theorem 1 and Lemma 16 every Jordan derivation of $FI(P,R)$ is a derivation if and only if for any isolated $\bar{x}$ of $\overline{P}$ every Jordan derivation of $RFM_{\bar{x}}(R)$ is a derivation.

Let $\bar{x}$ be an isolated element of $\overline{P}$. If $|\bar{x}| > 1$, then each Jordan derivation of $RFM_{\bar{x}}(R)$ is a derivation thanks to Theorem 2. If $|\bar{x}| = 1$, then $RFM_{\bar{x}}(R) \cong R$, so each Jordan derivation of $RFM_{\bar{x}}(R)$ is a derivation if and only if each Jordan derivation of R is a derivation.

It remains to note that the isolated elements of P are exactly those $x \in P$, for which $\bar{x}$ is isolated in $\overline{P}$ and $|\bar{x}| = 1$. □

The next Remark generalizes Theorem 3.3 from [9].

Remark 6. Let $(P, \preceq)$ be a preordered set and R a commutative unital ring. Then every R-linear Jordan derivation of $FI(P,R)$ is a derivation.

Indeed, if d is an R-linear Jordan derivation of $FI(P,R)$, then $d_{\bar{x}}$ is an R-linear Jordan derivation of $RFM_{\bar{x}}(R)$ for all $\bar{x} \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$. If $|\bar{x}| > 1$, then $d_{\bar{x}}$ is a derivation by Theorem 2. If $|\bar{x}| = 1$, then $d_{\bar{x}}$ may be identified with an R-linear Jordan derivation of R, which is trivial, as it maps 1 to 0 by (1). Thus, d is a derivation by Proposition 1.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to FAPESP of Brazil for the financial support (process number: 2012/01554–7) and to professor Zhankui Xiao for the valuable comments that helped to improve the article.

References

[1] Anderson, D., and Winders, M. Idealization of a module. *J. Commut. Algebra 1*, 1 (2009), 3–56.

[2] Benkovič, D. Jordan derivations and antiderivations on triangular matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl. 397* (2005), 235–244.

[3] Benkovič, D., and Širovnik, N. Jordan derivations of unital algebras with idempotents. *Linear Algebra Appl. 437* (2012), 2271–2284.

[4] Ghosseiri, N. M. Jordan derivations of some classes of matrix rings. *Taiwanese J. Math. 11*, 1 (2007), 51–62.

[5] Herstein, I. N. Jordan derivations of prime rings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 8* (1957), 1104–1110.

[6] Jacobson, N., and Rickart, C. E. Jordan homomorphisms of rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 69* (1950), 479–502.

[7] Khripchenko, N. S. Finitary incidence algebras of quasiorders. *Matematychni Studii 34*, 1 (2010), 30–37.

[8] Khripchenko, N. S., and Novikov, B. V. Finitary incidence algebras. *Comm. Algebra 37*, 5 (2009), 1670–1676.

[9] Xiao, Z. Jordan derivations of incidence algebras. *Rocky Mountain J. Math. 45*, 4 (2015), 1357–1368.

[10] Zhang, J.-H., and Yu, W.-Y. Jordan derivations of triangular algebras. *Linear Algebra Appl. 419* (2006), 251–255.

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC, Brazil, CEP: 88040–900
E-mail address: nskhripchenko@gmail.com